

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The present Response is responsive to the final Office Action mailed February 2, 2009 in the above-identified application.

Claims 2-17 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

### ***Rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Coyne, U.S. Patent No. 5,943,619. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As discussed in previous Amendments, according to an aspect of Applicant's invention as claimed in new claims 15 and 17, contracted service module 9 is connected between gateway 2 and home network 1 of a mobile subscriber unit. Thus, contracted service module 9 is connected on the home network side of gateway 2. Using such a configuration, when the currently roaming mobile subscriber is in a visited network, contracted service module 9 is able to determine whether a service generated by event generator 11 of the home network can be provided to the roaming subscriber terminal because second data storage unit 7 stores features data regarding services provided by the foreign network (Specification, page 7, line 24 - page 8, line 3). In such a way, the event-based service generated by event generator 11 of the home network can be provided to the mobile subscriber in the foreign network because module 9 consults second data storage unit 7 to determine whether the subscriber is located in a foreign network that is capable of providing such features.

Claim 17 requires a contracted service unit connected between the gateway and the home network, and a second data storage unit connected between the gateway and the home network, the contracted service module operable to provide the contracted advanced services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network by referring to the features data stored in the second data storage unit to determine whether the mobile subscriber unit is capable of receiving the contracted advanced services in the foreign network.

Coyne discloses a protocol enhancer (PE) module that interfaces between the home location register (HLR) of a mobile telecommunications network and a mobile switching center/visitor location register (MSC/VLR) of a visited mobile telecommunications network in order to provide additional subscriber data unique to the visited network, enabling the roaming mobile station to utilize additional subscriber features not provided by the first network (Coyne, Abstract). Coyne discloses that protocol enhancer 250 is located in visited network PLMN2 10B (Figure 3) such that, when roaming mobile station (MS) 30 is detected in the visited network, protocol enhancer 250 asks for subscriber data for MS 30 from HLR 50 of home network PLMN1 10A (Coyne, column 5, lines 36-49 and column 2, lines 20-28; Figure 3).

A summary of the system of Coyne and the functions of the protocol enhancer is provided at Coyne, column 2, lines 15-36. A service node known as protocol enhancer 250 and a MSC/VLR are located in the second mobile telecommunications network currently being visited by roaming MS 30. Protocol enhancer 250 receives an indication from roaming MS 30 to register it with a particular MSC/VLR 40 of visited network 10B. Then, the protocol enhancer communicates with HLR 50 of home network 10A to retrieve subscriber data for MS 30. The protocol enhancer then retrieves additional subscriber data associated with visited network 10B not provided by the HLR. This additional subscriber data is combined with the subscriber data provided by the HLR and sent to the local MSC/VLR of the visited network. The MSC/VLR, based on the combined subscriber information for the roaming MS, then provides subscriber features that are available in the second network to the roaming MS.

Coyne does not disclose or suggest a contracted service module connected between the gateway and the home network to provide the contracted advanced services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network, as required by claim 17. As discussed, protocol enhancer 250, as well as the MSC/VLR, are provided in visited network 10B.

Further, Coyne does not disclose or suggest providing contracted advanced services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network by referring to the features data stored in the second data storage unit being connected between the gateway and the home network, as further required by claim 17. Coyne is silent with respect to referring to features data in a second data storage unit connected between the gateway and the home network to determine whether the

mobile subscriber unit is capable of receiving a contracted advanced services in the foreign network, as further required by claims 17. Coyne teaches that HLR 50 and other features of home network 10A have no information about what features may be provided to roaming MS 30 by visited network 10B.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Coyne would have provided no suggestion or motivation for the problems recognized and solved by Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 17, because Coyne is silent with respect to providing contracted advanced services by the home network to the mobile subscriber unit traveling in the foreign network. As discussed, Coyne is concerned with providing services to roaming MS 30 by visited network 10B and in particular, providing services to MS 30 not provided by home network 10B.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the recitations of claim 17 would not have been obvious based on Coyne.

#### ***Rejection of Claims 2-5, 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 2-5, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Coyne, in view of Alperovich, U.S. Patent No. 5,960,356. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 requires a contracted service module connected between the gateway and the home network, and a second data storage unit connected between the gateway and the home network, the contracted service module operable to provide the contracted advanced services to the mobile subscriber unit in the foreign network by referring to the features data stored in the second data storage unit to determine whether the mobile subscriber unit is capable of receiving the contracted advanced services in the foreign network.

As discussed, Coyne does not disclose or suggest such features. Further, Coyne would have provided no suggestion or motivation for the problems recognized and solved by Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 17 because Coyne is silent with respect to providing contracted advance services by the hone network to the mobile subscriber unit traveling in the foreign network. Accordingly, Coyne does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 15.

Alperovich does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Coyne as they relate to the above-cited features of claim 15. Therefore, even taken together in combination, Coyne and Alperovich do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 15.

Claims 2-5 and 8 depend from claim 15, and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

***Rejection of Claims 6, 7 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 6, 7 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Coyne and Alperovich, in further view of Nilsson, WO 01/10109. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Nilsson does not cure the above-discussed features of Coyne and Alperovich as they relate to the above-recited features of claim 15. Further, the Office Action does not allege that Nilsson discloses or suggests such features. Accordingly, even taken together in combination, Coyne, Alperovich and Nilsson do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 15.

Claims 7 and 9-14 depend from claim 15, and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

***Rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claim 16 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Coyne and Alperovich, in further view of Rosenberg et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0013434. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rosenberg does not cure the above-discussed features of Coyne and Alperovich as they relate to the above-recited features of claim 15. Further, the Office Action does not allege that Rosenberg discloses or suggests such features. Accordingly, even taken together in combination, Coyne, Alperovich and Rosenberg do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 15.


Claim 16 depends from claim 15, and is therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims of the application are respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
EFS FILING SYSTEM  
ON May 1, 2009

RCF:GB/jl

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700